

REMARKS

Substance of Interview

Applicants thank the Examiner and her supervisor for the in-office interview held on February 10, 2004. The participants included Mylihn Tran and Kristine Kincaid of the USPTO and the applicants and applicant's representatives, David Miranda, Frank Occhiuti, Julian Orbanes, and Max Riesenhuber. To ensure a complete and proper recordation of the substance of the interview on, the following remarks are submitted in accordance with MPEP § 713.04.

A) Demonstrations were conducted showing a product that contains some embodiments of the inventions. Cell phones and PDA's were used to show the power of the interface and how it differed from Strasnick.

B) Claim 1 was primarily discussed.

C) Strasnick et al. (USPN 5,671,381).

D) There were no principle proposed amendments. Applicants pointed out differences from Strasnick and the Examiners pointed out whether or not such differences were included in the broadest claims.

E) The general thrust of the arguments was that the prior art of record failed to demonstrate applicant's claimed process that uses a zoom markup language.

F) See the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner re other cases also discussed.

G) No agreement was reached.

H) Not applicable to an in-office interview.

Specification-

Applicants have amended the abstract as suggested.

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

#### Claim Rejections-

The examiner rejected claims 1-12, 14-20, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Strasnick in view of Astiz et al., U.S. Patent number 6,035,330. Neither Strasnick nor Astiz, alone or in combination, teach or suggest each and every claim limitation of applicant's invention. Currently amended claim 1 recites using a zoom markup language to define said plurality of data objects, wherein said zoom markup language includes a first predefined tag that includes an attribute corresponding to a dimension in said virtual space.

In contrast to the applicants' invention, Strasnick does not make reference to a markup language for zooming, let alone a markup language that includes a first predefined tag that includes an attribute corresponding to a dimension in said virtual space.

Astiz also fails to teach or suggest this limitation. Astiz discloses an Internet navigational mapping system. [see Abstract] Astiz states in the background that Web pages are written using HTML, a widely known markup language. HTML, however, is a language with a set of particular tags that cannot be changed by a programmer. A programmer must use the particular tags so that an HTML interpreter can understand the HTML file and generate a display based on that file. HTML is not a zoom markup language and does not include a first predefined tag that includes an attribute corresponding to a dimension in said virtual space. Because neither Strasnick nor Astiz, alone or in combination, teach or suggest this limitation, claims 1, and 23, and all of their dependent claims distinguishes from Strasnick and Astiz.

Claim 12 and its dependent claims also distinguish from Strasnick and Astiz for the reasons above. Further, claim 12 includes the additional limitation wherein said screen zoom markup language includes a predefined tag that includes an attribute corresponding to a dimension in said virtual space at which said display screen is located.

The applicant asks that all claims be allowed.

Enclosed is a \$475 check for the Petition for Extension of Time fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**


Applicant : Orbanes et al.  
Serial No. : 09/783,417  
Filed : February 14, 2001  
Page : 11 of 11

Attorney's Docket No.: 15578-018001

Respectfully submitted,

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

5/10/04




David Miranda  
Reg. No. 42,898

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
225 Franklin Street  
Boston, MA 02110-2804  
Telephone: (617) 542-5070  
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

20799915.doc

BEST AVAILABLE COPY



BEST AVAILABLE COPY